K 1291 8

QUERIES

UPON

LIBERTY,

THE

FREEDOM of the PRESS,

INDEPENDENCY, &c.

By a real Friend to the CONSTITUTION, in *Church* and *State*,

---

Qui capit ille facit.

DUBLIN:

Printed by JAMES HOEY, Junior, at the Mercury in Parliament-ſtreet,

MDCCLXVIII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

The PUBLISHER,

TO THE

READER.

THE following Queries being much approved of, whilſt they were weekly publiſhed in my paper, *The* DUBLIN MERCURY; and much ſought for ſince; induced me to collect them in this pamphlet, that they may the more conveniently be preſerved.

From theſe Queries, the reader will be the better enabled to judge, whether the Authors and Publiſhers of ſome of the late, and preſent weekly productions, are real friends to Liberty, the Conſtitution, or to mankind; as alſo, in what *true Liberty*, the *freedom of the Preſs*, and *Independency*, conſiſt.

QUERIES

QUERIES

UPON

LIBERTY, &c.

Good Mr. MERCURY,

PRAY, what is the reaſon that your very entertaining and inſtructive paper ſtill continues at the ſmall price of *one halfpenny*? Is it becauſe, it is not filled with the abuſe of all that are in power, or authority over us, and with every ſpecies of ſcandal, detraction, and inſolence, that you dare not venture to encreaſe the price of it? Or, is it really from the principles of humanity and charity, and that you would rather thrive moderately and by degrees, than with more expedition grow wealthy at the expence of the characters, and happineſs of others? Do you think you are not as well intitled to avail yourſelf of the *freedom of the preſs*, and that appetite that is ſo predominant in numbers for detraction and levelling, as any other publick printer whatſoever? Or, do you conſider this free-

dom in a different light, from thoſe who have more extraordinary notions of *Liberty?*

And now that I have commenced my correſpondence with you in the *queſtioning way*, I ſhall proceed in the ſame manner until you tell me, that I have ſufficiently exhauſted your patience; it is a method of writing the moſt familiar and eaſy, and may be more acceptable to the generality of readers, than a tedious chain of dry arguments, or the mazy deductions of intricate reaſoning. But before I begin, I muſt aſſure you, that there does not live a man, who is, and ever has been, a greater advocate for the *freedom of the preſs*, in the true and real ſenſe of the terms, than him who troubles you with this: He does, and ever has conſidered it, as one of thoſe moſt invaluable bleſſings, which, we only, as a *free people* under our good and *gracious ſovereign*, by virtue of our moſt glorious conſtitution, of all the earth enjoy——then, to the point.

QUERE 1. Do you conſider *Liberty* as a power of doing only what the *Laws permit*; and of not being compelled to do, what the *Laws do not command?*

2. Or, do you conſider *it* as a *right* of carrying every *deſire* into action, although it ſhould violate thoſe equal laws, which have been eſtabliſhed for the benefit of the *whole?*

3. Do you conceive, that by the *freedom of the preſs*, is meant an unreſerved, diſcretionary power for every man to publiſh his own thoughts on any ſubject, and in any manner, *which is not forbidden by the laws of the land*, without being obliged to apply for *a licence or privilege* for ſo doing?

4. Or,

4. Or, do you think that this *freedom* conſiſts in an *unreſtrained power* to undermine the fundamentals of *government* and *religion?* a *Licentious freedom* to revile our lawful governours and magiſtrates? to traduce the eſtabliſhed laws and religion of our country? to attempt to weaken and ſubvert, by opprobrious writings, that ſacred reſpect and veneration, which ought always to be maintained for authority, and perſons in authority?

5. Or, that it conſiſts in making the preſs an engine to deſtroy the reputation of our neighbours, or to prejudice any private ſubject, by inſulting his perſonal frailties, misfortunes, or defects; or by expoſing the ſecrets of his family to publick laughter and ridicule? In making a publick paper a common ciſtern, wherein, the envious, the malevolent, and malicious, may diſembogue, unpuniſhed, the deadly venom of their rancoured hearts?

6. And as the word *independent* is a term moſt frequently uſed in our hebdomadal papers, and almoſt as often on both ſides, by thoſe who are oppoſite to each other, as well in party as in principle, I, therefore, requeſt that you will alſo inform me (if you can) whether by an *independent*, is meant a perſon, who uninfluenced by intereſt, unawed by power, and unbiaſſed by prejudice, acts upon all occaſions, when called upon, according to the dictates of a well informed mind?

7. Or, doth it ſignify a perſon of a perturbed, reſtleſs ſpirit, yoked invincibly, under the notion of *freedom*, to a furious firebrand party, fraught with principles

principles of eternal oppoſition and reſiſtance, ſubverſive of all government and order ?

8. Can there be a ſtronger proof of a baſe and reprobate mind, than to fix on ſome particular perſon, as an object of detraction, and without daring to give the name of either the author, or the victim (but in order meanly to evade the law) by emblematical deſignations, taken from his ſtation in life, occupation, or profeſſion, ſo to mark him, that every perſon, in the ſame ſociety, muſt as clearly know the man who is meant, as if his name had been ſet down in capital characters ?

9. Is this conſiſtent with juſtice, is it conſiſtent with liberty ? Nay, is it not inconſiſtent with both ? with charity, and with that golden rule, of *doing to others as we would, they ſhould do unto us ?* Is it not alſo inconſiſtent with the character of a gentleman, or the temper of a Chriſtian ?

10. Is it not the work of an aſſaſſin ? is it not an abſolute ſtabbing in the dark ?

11. And to what end ? Is it correction ? Doth it not rather ſerve to provoke the vice, and harden the man ?

12. Doth there exiſt a man who has not ſomewhat in his compoſition, or in his private character, that envy and malice (if ſo inclined) may not thus work with ? or, is it not moſt eaſy to invent ? and have not too many inſtances of the latter been in ſome of our publick papers of late ?

13. Doth

13. Doth not *true ſatire* conſiſt in laſhing the folly, or the *vice*, and not the *man?* and is not the contrary *defamation?*

14 Doth that writer deſerve the leaſt degree of credit, that ſhall in one paper traduce a man in ſuch a manner, as to render him the contempt of ſociety, and in the next ſhall give the ſame perſon every perfection, every virtue under Heaven, according as he has, or has not gratified the whim, caprice or humour of this enthuſiaſtic projector, and his infatuated followers?

15. Is this modeſty? or is it not a flagrant, overt attempt to impoſe upon the judgment, nay, upon the very ſenſes of men? Is it not too much for any zeal to ſubmit to, that is not abſolute frenzy?

16. Will it make any amends to a man whoſe character is defamed in one paper, diſperſed perhaps, through different kingdoms, to tell in a ſucceeding one, that the authors of the detraction were miſtaken, for that he was moſt excellent?

17. May it not happen, that not one in ten of thoſe who had read the firſt of theſe characters, might ever meet with the ſecond? and if they did, (unleſs mankind be more inclined to believe good than evil of others) may they not be too apt to think that it was ſome contrivance? and could a man who had done this irreparable injury, and had a ſpark of virtue, or the leaſt remorſe or feeling, ſleep in his bed?

18. Would

18. Would not an inſtance of ſuch a fatal miſrepreſentation, either detected, or even acknowledged, be a proof of ſuch raſhneſs (to give it the mildeſt term): as muſt to every ſober virtuous man, be a ſufficient inducement never more to meddle with ſuch poiſon, or to give the leaſt degree of credit or countenance to its authors?

19. According to our moſt glorious, and much envied conſtitution, no man by the laws, can be deprived of either life, or property, but by a fair and legal trial by his peers, and yet are either of them of any value to a truly virtuous man, when his good name is injured? Shall then theſe high profeſſors of liberty in this raſh manner, deprive a perſon of that ineſtimable gem?

20. Ought ſuch evils as I have here mentioned to be tolerated in a free ſtate? are they not deſtructive of all virtuous, real liberty? and could any man in his ſenſes ſay, that a *legal reſtraint* of them would be the leaſt infringement of that liberty?

21. Is not the avidity with which all ſcurrilous papers are ſought for, and read, a reproach to humanity? Is it not the ſtrongeſt proof that can be given of that levelling principle, which is deſtructive of all order, the baneful offspring of unworthineſs and envy?

22. But ſuppoſe, that one of theſe firebrands ſhall have ſucceeded to the utmoſt of his wiſhes; that he hath by his productions, expoſed both the publick and private characters of our *rulers* and *magiſtrates*, and hath ſo inflamed the lower people, made diſſolute

lute and reprobate, from neglecting their callings, and a courſe of idleneſs, that they are ready to tear in pieces all thoſe at whom he ſhall halloo them, what end would it anſwer? *

23. Are we not taught by every law, religious and moral, to reſpect our ſuperiors, and thoſe who are in authority over us? and does not common prudence tell us, that this reſpect is the main pillar of all government, and that without it, there can be no government, nothing but confuſion and anarchy?

24. But who are they who have for ſome years paſt ſo much diſturbed the peace and order of this kingdom? Are they of thoſe, who from principle, are the profeſſed enemies of all decorum and order? of all government both in church and ſtate, except their own no-government? Are they *Fanaticks*, or are they *Enthuſiaſts?*

25 Can

* As the proper and true liberty of the preſs, was never better expreſſed than it was in the Propoſals which were printed previous to the publication of one of our weekly papers—I ſhall here give it in the very words.

" That all perſons ſhall be invited, by publick advertiſe-
" ments, to ſend to the ſaid preſs, all ſuch Intelligences, Ad-
" vices, Notices, Narratives of Facts, well atteſted, Eſſays,
" Schemes, Propoſals, and Projects, as they think may tend
" to promote the WISDOM, KNOWLEDGE, VIRTUE, LOY-
" ALTY, WEALTH and PROSPERITY OF THE NATION;
" and from time to time to adviſe the Conductors of the ſaid
" preſs of all flagrant, public offences againſt LAW, RELI-
" GION, HUMANITY, OR THE RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES
" OF THE SUBJECT, within their reſpective neighbourhoods
" throughout the kingdom."

But at that time, a perſon was concerned, whoſe gentleneſs of manners, politeneſs and honeſty of heart, were equal to the fine genius it is well known he poſſeſſes; the author of GUSTAVUS VASA; but he quickly withdrew himſelf.

25. Can a man be *a real patriot* and deſtitute of *private virtue?* or can true patriotiſm be, where the heart is not right?

26. Is not the intemperance of liberty, the purveyor of ſlavery? and have not men by fancying themſelves ſlaves, made themſelves ſo in reality?

27. Or can liberty be good for thoſe who poſſeſs it, but when it is under the direction of virtue?

28. Is not popularity a vice from the moment it is ſought? and muſt not ſuch a popular man be an eternal ſlave to the wills, opinions and judgments of thoſe, whom he ſeeks for his followers?

29. Doth not his exiſtence depend upon the want of honeſty? and ſhould he ever even affect it, is he not loſt?

30. And in this caſe, on which ſide doth liberty (if the leaſt degree of it can be ſaid to be on either) really lye, with the leader, or his followers?

31. If government ſhould ever be compelled from either a wanton, or a ſelf-intereſted oppoſition, in order to carry on the neceſſary buſineſs of the ſtate, to buy off thoſe who are moſt ready to be ſold, and who for the purpoſe, are ever in array againſt them, where ought the blame to lie?

32. If ſuch an outrageous oppoſition ſhould be given by the people, to the execution of the laws, that its proceſs could not be executed by any force of the civil power, and that without the aid of the military

military power, there could be no ſecurity of life or property, who then would be to blame on calling in this power?

33. Would it be prudent to arm and diſcipline for the ſervice of the nation, any of thoſe who ſhould be guilty of theſe outrages againſt law and government?

34. Or is a militia a proper meaſure for a nation, that is as far from being ſufficiently peopled, as its lower claſſes are from being induſtrious, or amenable to the laws?

35. Are there ſufficient of the eſtabliſhed religion, of whom to form a militia, and ought it not, if poſſible, to be formed of theſe only?

36. Are not the church and ſtate ſo linked and connected, that they muſt ſtand and fall together? And if ſo, are any perſons ſo proper to be entruſted with the defence of either, as they who are the real friends to the government in both?

37. If the many thouſands who were concerned in ſome late diſturbances, had been armed and diſciplined, what might have been at this day, the conſequences?

38. In a mixt government (as ours is) doth not the ſafety, yea, the very exiſtence of it, depend upon the preſervation of an equal ballance among the three conſtituent parts, the *King*, the *Nobles*, and the *People*?

 39. Hath

39. Hath not the power of the people, of late years, been viſibly increaſing in theſe kingdoms?

40. And have not the conſequences almoſt invariably been, in all nations where it has happened, firſt, *anarchy*, and at length, *abſolute monarchy* or *tyranny?* Was it not ſo at *Athens* and at *Rome*, &c. and was it not ſo with us in the laſt century? And who were they who effected it?

41. Have not the revolutions which have happened in moſt ſtates, been ſet on foot by a ſingle *incendiary?* And have not thoſe incendiaries been, in the general, the moſt profligate? And is there not ſuch a character at preſent in a neighbouring nation?

42. May not any abuſes in the military eſtabliſhment, or ill behaviour of the ſoldiery, be corrected, redreſſed, and regulated? And are any neglects which might have been in either of thoſe caſes, a reaſon to leave the kingdom defenceleſs? Or is the abuſe of any thing, that can be rectified, an argument againſt the uſe of it?

43. Can a military force be of that danger to liberty, as has been ſo much urged and magnified, whilſt the people are the paymaſters, and have the funds in their power?

44. And is not the money which is granted by the *people* for that purpoſe in this kingdom, moſtly ſpent among us?

45. In

45. In our conſtitution, were not the prerogatives of our kings given them by the *people* for the advantage of the whole? And are not theſe and the rights of the people equally ſacred? and can either be infringed without endangering the whole? *

46. And according to our conſtitution, hath not the ordering, and diſpoſition of the forces of the kingdom been ever in the king? And do not expediency and neceſſity require it ſhould be ſo, and that he ſhould be the judge of *emergencies?*

47. But are not the military branch of the eſtabliſhment, the accounts thereon, as alſo the conduct of the ſeveral perſons concerned therein as much ſubject to the inſpection and juriſdiction of parliament, as any other branch of the eſtabliſhment? And ſhould there be any abuſes therein, may they not, not only be corrected, but prevented for the future?

48. Will any man ſay that we do not partake of the benefit of our late conqueſts? Is not the ſtaple commodity of our kingdom (which is free from duty) protected? And have we not in conſequence of thoſe conqueſts, ten times the tract of country that we had before to deal with us in it?

49. Have not as large ſums been offered for ſeats in Burroughs ſince the act for the limitation of parliaments, as were given before, and this by ſeveral of

* King Charles the firſt made this anſwer to the PETITION OF RIGHTS, "The people's liberties ſtrengthen the king's "prerogative, and the king's prerogative is to defend the peo- "ple's liberties."

no viſible ſubſtance? and are there not as ſtrong appearances of expenſive elections as ever?

50. And is not this a melancholy preſage of the ſmall advantage, which this bill may be of to this nation?

51. Can it be ſuppoſed that they who purchaſe in this manner will not ſell? Hath not a long experience evinced that they will?

52. Might it not be ſome means of preventing not only theſe miſchiefs, but the many alſo which may ariſe from the future frequency of elections, if not only the repreſentatives for counties and burroughs were to be choſen by ballot, but alſo all others whatſoever in every caſe where elections are to be, from the higheſt to the loweſt office in the community?

53. And would it not be well for the conſtitution, if there were not to be any repreſentatives in the houſe of commons but for counties and cities?

54. Are the repreſentatives of the ſeveral counties, cities and boroughs to be directed, or dictated to by their reſpective conſtituents, as to their conduct in parliament? Or are they only to receive their inſtructions as to the matters to be propoſed for the conſideration of the whole?

55. Can it be conceived, that the conſtituents of every county, city and borough, would think alike on every ſubject or matter to be propoſed for a law? Or would it be poſſible to bring them to meet for ſuch a concurrence in opinion and directions?

56. And

56. And were it to be otherwiſe, would there not be an eternal claſhing of intereſts?

57. Should then any member of the legiſlature, upon any queſtion, reſolve to vote on any ſide of it, until he had heard it diſcuſſed and debated on, would there not be good reaſon to diſcredit his integrity, or his judgment?

58. Would ſuch a man be a proper perſon to be intruſted with the rights and priviledges of the people?

59. Doth *he* merit the name of a *patriot*, doth he merit the name of an honeſt man, who has determined to vote, and always does vote on the ſide of the oppoſition to government? Nay, is not ſuch a conduct abſolute faction?

60. Can it be juſtified by that trite, political, wicked maxim, *that the party muſt ſupport itſelf at all events?* May it not as well juſtify a gang of highwaymen?

61. Are not the repreſentatives of the people the *judges* in the *legiſlature?* And ought any judge to determine on any queſtion, until he hath heard the evidence on both ſides, or the matter fully debated?

62. If the electors were not to ſuffer candidates to be at any expence on elections, might they not then well expect that their repreſentatives ſhould attend to their inſtructions; but can they in reaſon hope for this from the man they have beggared?

63. Can a conſtitution like ours, be ſaid to be in a ſtate of ſafety, whilſt boroughs are monopolized, and every day publickly ſold?

64. And are not they of whom ſuch boroughs are compoſed, the meaneſt of wretches, who ſubmit to be transferred from proprietor to proprietor, like horſes or dogs?

65. On petitions againſt electians, alledged to have been unduly obtained, ought not the real merits of the caſe to be only conſidered?

66. If after a perſon hath been elected, and perhaps at a moſt ſhameful expence, he ſhould be turned out by a majority of voices in the houſe, in conſequence of a ſuperior intereſt that his competitor may have, from his connections there, of what avail will free electors be?

67. Is not that other old and hackneyed phraſe, *that committees of Elections are committees of affections*, againſt honour, truth, and juſtice? Is it not a reproach to humanity?

68. Is not the *Candidate* who bribes an *Elector* to vote for him, and afterwards ſtands by, and hears him perjure himſelf, the more wicked man of the two, and as injurious to the Conſtitution?

69. Is he not rather more guilty of the bribery and perjury than the wretch whom he hath tempted? And ought ſuch a man to be one of the repreſentatives of the nation?

70. Would

70. Would it not be well, if no Freeholders under ten pounds a year were to vote at elections for Counties? And would it not be better, if it were to be twenty inſtead of ten pounds a year?

71. Although the Octennial Bill ſhould produce ſome legal *converts*, yet will it make *proteſtants?* Or will the children of ſuch converts be proteſtants?

72. Are not they who ſeek employments, offices, or penſions, as rewards for their ſervices to government, like lawyers, to be feed on every motion?

73. Do not reverſionary grants of employments and offices, tend to the deſtruction of merit, and to the diminution of the dignity and authority, not only of the prince who grants them, but of his ſucceſſor?

74. Is he who would inſiſt on any ſuch improper grant, as the condition of his ſervice, a friend to his king, his country, or its conſtitution?

75. Should any of his demands, however unreaſonable, be not complied with, will he not immediately act, as if all former obligations, however numerous, were totally obliterated?

76. Do motives of gratitude ever operate but on a generous mind? And is this to be often met with among courtiers, or time-ſervers?

77. Is it poſſible that an ungrateful man, or he who is falſe to his friend and his neighbour, can ever be true to his king, or his country?

78. Have

78. Have there been many inſtances of perſons being Patriots, who have been ſlaves to avarice, or lovers of power?

79. Are not *Poyning's law*, *penſions*, *the reſtraint on the woollen trade of the kingdom*, and *an union*, the hackneyed baits which every new profeſſor of *Patriotiſm* throws out to hook the ſorry gudgeons, that are ever ready to ſwallow them?

80. Can it be ſuppoſed that England, whilſt it means to preſerve a ſuperiority here, will ever give up the advantage they have by Poyning's law? And may we not as well think of compelling them to renounce the kingdom?

81. Is not the granting of *penſions*, the undoubted prerogative of our kings, to enable them to reward merit, and to provide for old and faithful ſervants?

82. Hath it not been ſo, time immemorial, and have not the wiſeſt of our anceſtors, thought that for the honour and dignity of the crown, it is moſt fit it ſhould be ſo?

83. And although this power of granting penſions might, at times, have been abuſed, yet can this in reaſon be an argument againſt the right and legality of granting them?

84. Hath not this right been confirmed by the uninterrupted practice of ages? And is it not confirmed every ſeſſions by the tax theſe grants are charged with? *

85. But

* See Seld. Tit. of Honour, 838.—7 Rep. 12.—Stat. 24 Hen. VIII. c. 20 5 Mod. 53, 54. l. 55.

85. But have not the commons a ſufficient power to prevent the miſapplication of the publick money in this, or any other reſpect, by their refuſing the ſupplies?

86. If ten times the quantity of linen which we export, would be taken from us, if we could provide it, is it not better then to purſue it with our moſt earneſt attention, than to raiſe the jealouſy of our neighbours, by interfering with them?

87. Would not the further extenſion of the linen manufacture be the means of improving, making fertile and populous whole tracts of land in the South and Weſt of Ireland, which now lye under ſheep-walks, uncultivated, uninhabited, nay almoſt deſert?

88. Is there not a proof of this in the North? Are not the lands there inferiour, many degrees, in ſoil, to thoſe in the South and the Weſt, and yet are not many parts of the former, far better improved and inhabited than the others? And is not this entirely cauſed by the linen manufacture?

89. Can we ſuppoſe that England will ever ſuffer an union of the two kingdoms?

90. Is there not almoſt a moral certainty, that the people of England in general would never conſent to the addition of members, which the repreſentatives for this kingdom would make to their parliament?

91. Would the trading towns in England ever conſent that the people of Ireland ſhould partake of a free and general trade with them?

92. And would not the loſs to the crown in ſuch of the revenues of this kingdom, as it has the diſpoſal of, be more than it can be conceived will ever be conſented to?

93. Is it not downright folly, or abſolute phrenzy, to torment ourſelves with the fears of things that are never likely to happen? Or to ſeek, or attempt the alteration, or redreſs of others, which we muſt know, there is not any likelihood of their being ever in the leaſt altered?

94. Are not whole days waſted by the lower people, in their attention to theſe matters, to the neglect of their ſeveral trades and callings, and the abſolute beggary of themſelves and families?

95. Would it not be better to ſet about the correction and improvement of ſuch things, as it may be in our power to effect?

96. And would the man, who for the ſake of popularity, ſhould be induſtrious to promote ſuch diſturbances and miſchiefs, be a *real patriot* or *an enemy* to his country?

97. Muſt not he who courts popularity, act often inconſiſtently? May it not happen, that he muſt at one time publickly abet, or, at leaſt, conſent to meaſures, that he hath at other times as publickly oppoſed, or exclaimed againſt?

62. And

98. And would a truly honeſt man, be in ſuch a ſituation for any advantage, which this world could give him? Or could even his very followers think him honeſt, although they ſhould bear him with huzzas upon their ſhoulders?

99. Is not a general election, an unerring teſt of the univerſal corruption and deceit of mankind?

100. Are either the promiſes which are extorted, or the promiſes which are made upon ſuch an occaſion, really with a view to ſerve the country, or the private purpoſes of the parties? Or is truth the object of either?

101. And ſhould any, with the view of being again choſen, vote otherwiſe, than as they well knew they ought to vote, would they be honeſt? Might they not at one ſtroke do more miſchief, than it might ever be in their power to repair?

102. Will not a real Patriot ever vote according to the dictates of truth, and a well informed judgment, let the conſequences be what they may?

103. Is being loud and vehement, and ever railing at the court, and the meaſures of government, a proof of patriotiſm?

104. If it be for the ſake of popularity, is it not infernal proceeding?

105. May not private connections be as miſchievous in a ſtate, as bribery and corruption?

106. Do not the peace and happineſs, nay, the very being of every ſociety, depend upon a mutual confidence and harmony between thoſe who govern, and thoſe who are governed?

107. And ought any attempt to be made to deſtroy, or even in the leaſt to interrupt this confidence and harmony, but upon the ſtrongeſt certainty of real cauſe for ſo doing?

108. Are not bitter perſonal invective and obloquy, a ſet of hackneyed phraſes of grievances; falſe aſſertions, and artful inſinuations of evil deſigns and machinations of government; a pompous, rapid, and obſcure rotation of periods, prepared for the purpoſe, with a ſcowling countenance, a look of ire, a cloſe clinched fiſt, and a brawling voice, the true ingredients for the compoſition of a *modern Patriot* and *Orator?*

109. And when this is the caſe, in the ſtead of argumentation and reaſoning, may we not well conclude, that the authors have ſome other views than information; or redreſs of grievances?

110. Hath not a thirſt of oratory become of late years as predominant in theſe kingdoms, as it was among the Greeks and Romans?

111. Were not almoſt all the profeſſed orators among the Greeks and Romans, deceivers? And have there been many among the moderns, who were not alſo deceivers?

112. Should

112. Should oratory be exerciſed in the great aſſembly of the nation, as it is too often done by the hireling pleader in the halls of juſtice, in making falſhood appear truth, and truth falſhood, or in making a bad cauſe appear a good one, and the reverſe, would it not be better for ſociety that it had never exiſted?

113 Would it not be well, that none of the craft of the profeſſion of the law, ſhould ever be uſed in the great aſſembly of the nation?

114. But hath not the ſpirit of oratory deſcended even to the loweſt of the people, to the promotion of idleneſs, faction, diſſipation and waſte?

115. Would not a parcel of beggarly orators, be but a ſorry ſubſtitute of ſkilful, wealthy merchants, traders and mechanicks?

116. Would not a reſident viceroy be an advantage to Ireland? Would it not be the means of diſſolving factions, and preſerving the inteſtine peace of the kingdom?

117. Are not trials by juries the principal ſecurity of our lives and properties, the main pillar of the liberties of the ſubject? And hath it not ever been the beſt defence againſt tyranny, and arbitrary power, whenever they were attempted?

118. Should it then ever happen, that matters of property were to be determined by a majority of voices in any publick aſſembly, be it ever ſo reſpecta-

ble, might there not quickly be an end of that inestimable bulwark?

119. Would not such a proceeding be directly in the teeth of our great charter?

120. Yet hath it not been attempted, to serve private purposes? And that too by professed patriots?

121. Where the *freedom of the press* is so fully enjoyned as it is with us, may it not be more prudent not to take notice of many things that may be published, than to bring them into question?

122. And have not many things by being so noticed been made of consequence, which if despised, had died with the day on which they were produced?

123. But yet should treason, or the grossest and most outrageous insult upon majesty, be uttered under the colour of this freedom of the press, is the author not to be prosecuted for it, nor punished, if guilty, because it has happened that some improper steps were taken by ministerial officers in the proceedings against him.

124. Is the improper proceeding of the ministerial officer to discharge the traitor? And is the officer only to be punished? Is the offence of one man to discharge the offence of another?

125. Ought not both to be punished, if guilty, according to their respective offences? And would not this be equal justice?

126. Have

126. Have not the moſt infernal attempts appeared in ſome of the late productions on this ſubject, to bring the beſt of princes, into the utmoſt diſtreſs, by compelling him to a dependence upon the military power only, and then to deprive him of that.

127. And do not theſe productions plainly manifeſt the real intentions of a certain ſet of people, to effect by any means whatſoever, their much and ever wiſhed for government, a Democracy?

128. Are not promiſes previous to elections, directly in the teeth of the conſtitution? And is not this what the moraliſts call *malum in ſe*.

129. And if ſuch promiſes are improper or unguardedly obtained, or made, ought they to be performed? Or would any honeſt virtuous man require the performance of them.

130. Is any promiſe to be kept, that may be injurious to the *publick*, however beneficial it may be to any one, or any number of individuals, in a private capacity?

131. To conclude, have not the wild and extravagant notions of *liberty*, *freedom of writing* and *independency*, which of late years have been ſo much propagated amongſt us, been of the greateſt detriment to the kingdom?

132. Have they not been productive of the moſt violent animoſities, feuds and diſorders, as alſo of great idleneſs, eſpecially among the lower claſſes of the people.

133. And

133. And if there ſhall be any extraordinary puniſhment hereafter, may we not well ſuppoſe it will be for that abandoned Villain who from ſelfiſh views, and for his own private emolument, ſhould, under the ſhew and ſemblance of patriotiſm, fire with groundleſs fears and jealouſies the poor deluded populace; nor reſt, until he has rouſed them, even to the outrageous diſturbance of ſociety?

FINIS.

6 DE 58